

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

Pauline Camillo,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Civil Action No.: _____
v.	:	
	:	
Lustig, Glaser & Wilson, P.C.; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,	:	COMPLAINT
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	:	

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Pauline Camillo, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendants and its agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.

2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1337.

3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. The Plaintiff, Pauline Camillo ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Rockland, Massachusetts, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

5. Defendant Lustig, Glaser & Wilson, P.C. (“LGW”), is a Massachusetts business entity with an address of 245 Winter Street, Suite 300, Waltham, Massachusetts 02451, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

6. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by LGW and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

7. LGW at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

8. The Plaintiff allegedly incurred a financial obligation (the “Debt”) to an original creditor (the “Creditor”).

9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to LGW for collection, or LGW was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. LGW Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

12. Beginning in September, 2013, LGW contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt.

13. LGW placed calls to Plaintiff at a rate of over three calls per week. During several conversations with Plaintiff LGW failed to identify its company name, and failed to inform

Plaintiff that the communication was an attempt to collect the Debt and that any information obtained thereafter would be used for the purpose of debt collection.

14. On December 23, 2013, Plaintiff received a summons through the mail from LGW. That same day, Plaintiff contacted LGW and spoke to a collector. During the conversation Plaintiff asked the Collector if she needed an attorney. In response, the Collector falsely stated that Plaintiff did not need an attorney nor did she need to appear for the court date.

15. During the same conversation, the Collector deceived Plaintiff by telling her that the purpose of the court date was to “document Plaintiff’s financial information”.

16. Under the assurance from LGW that she did not need to go to the court date, Plaintiff failed to appear. As a result, the court awarded LGW a default judgment which resulted in a lien being placed on Plaintiff’s property.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

17. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants’ unlawful conduct.

18. As a direct consequence of the Defendants’ acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

19. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

20. The Defendants’ conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendants engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt.

21. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(6) in that Defendants placed calls to the Plaintiff without disclosing the identity of the debt collection agency.

22. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e in that Defendants used false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of a debt.

23. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) in that Defendants employed false and deceptive means to collect a debt.

24. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(11) in that Defendants failed to inform the consumer that the communication was an attempt to collect a debt.

25. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(15) in that Defendants falsely informed the Plaintiff that no action was necessary when the Plaintiff had received legal process.

26. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f in that Defendants used unfair and unconscionable means to collect a debt.

27. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

28. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

COUNT II
VIOLATION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT,
M.G.L. c. 93A § 2, et seq.

29. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

30. The Defendants employed unfair or deceptive acts to collect the Debt, in violation of M.G.L. c. 93A § 2.

31. The Defendants initiated communication via telephone with the Plaintiff in excess of two calls in each seven-day period in violation of 940 CMR § 7.04(1)(f).

32. The Defendants communicated by telephone without disclosure of their business name, in violation of 940 CMR § 7.04(1)(d).

33. The Defendants knowingly made false or misleading representation in any communication as to the character, extent or amount of the debt, or as to its status in any legal proceeding, in violation of 940 CMR § 7.07(2).

34. Defendant's failure to comply with these provisions constitutes an unfair or deceptive act under M.G.L. c. 93A § 9 and, as such, the Plaintiff is entitled to double or treble damages plus reasonable attorney's fees.

COUNT III
INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION

35. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

36. The Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, "One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person."

37. Massachusetts further recognizes the Plaintiff's right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus Defendant violated Massachusetts state law.

38. The Defendant intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff's right to privacy by continually harassing the Plaintiff with the above-referenced phone calls.

39. The telephone calls made by Defendant to the Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered, "hounding the plaintiff," and, "a substantial

burden to her existence," thus satisfying the Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) requirement for an invasion of privacy.

40. The conduct of the Defendant in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

41. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from Defendant.

42. All acts of Defendant and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, Defendant is subject to punitive damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against Defendants;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) against Defendants;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against Defendants;
4. Double or treble damages plus reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to M.G.L. c. 93A § 3(A);
5. Actual damages from Defendants for the all damages including intentional, reckless, and/or negligent violations of the FDCPA and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;
6. Punitive damages; and
7. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: April 24, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ Sergei Lemberg

Sergei Lemberg (BBO# 650671)
LEMBERG LAW, L.L.C.
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (203) 653-3424
Attorneys for Plaintiff